

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I202-3

Short Proposal Title: Estuary Action Challenge

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Objectives: educational, not scientific/ecological; data needed to test lacking – litter types/quantity; water quality, types/quantity of exotic plants; #/type of targeted species. What's the problem with these creeks, marshes? Where's pollution coming from? (local, upstream) From whom?

Hypothesis: includes that environmental education leads to understanding of restoration activities

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Conceptual model clear; integrated with multiple grades and family program. No scientific basis of proposed work – why/how these creeks/marsh selected; why trees, wildflowers (which species?) should be planted; assumption that artificial frog propagation and release is desirable (purpose?); data analysis not clearly described.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No description nor connection to on-going restoration projects of local agencies nor on-going site monitoring feedback; collaborative use of data. Are species being planted at right time of year; location; design plan?

What is water levels are particularly high or low during plantings? Contingency? No indication that applicant has had success in past restoration actions in its 8 years of program.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Lacks scientific monitoring to determine success/effectiveness of tasks. No description of method/tool to use for assessing change in students' appreciation and understanding of restoration activities. Success shouldn't be based on # of participants doing activity, rather, effectiveness of activity.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Unclear data collection protocols; quality control; data analysis.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Education activities seem feasible. More curricular description for field activities is desirable. Time allotted seems okay. No information on use of partners' contributions.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Fine for educational tasks. Probably adequate for scientific tasks but in sufficient information here.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☒ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]
